REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, and 13-26 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 19 and 23 have been amended without narrowing their scope. Claims 1, 7 and 15-18, 19 and 23 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 7, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for an alleged lack of enablement. The Office Action appears to have taken the position that the specification does not support the recited feature of claim 1 that the intended server receives the server specific information from the second server. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to more clearly recite that the server specific information transmitted to the browser contains the identity of the second server if the shared data file has been moved from the intended server to the second server. This is believed clearly supported and enabled by the specification.

As to claims 19 and 23, these claims have never recited the feature objected to by the Examiner and should not have been rejected on the same ground as claims 1 and 7. For at least the foregoing reasons, it is requested that the rejections under Section 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action took the position that the term "the intended server identified by the server-specific information" does not have antecedent basis. This term has been amended to read: "the one of the first and second intended servers identified by the server-specific information." This makes it even more clear that the shared data is downloaded from the first or the second intended server, depending upon which one of those servers is identified by the SSI. Although not specifically rejected, similar language in claim 23 has been amended as

14

well. In view of the above, withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

In the most recent Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 11 and 14 (and presumably 15-18) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0037266 (Schroeder) in view of U.S. Patent 5,859,971 (Bittinger et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,279,001 (DeBettencourt et al.). Claims 3, 6, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Schroeder and Bittinger et al. (and presumably DeBettencourt et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,852,717 (Bhide et al.). Claims 19, 22, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Schroeder. Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Schroeder in view of Bhide et al. Applicant traverse.

Independent Claims 1 and 7

Claim 1 is directed to a method of identifying a server that is one of a plurality of servers from a client terminal having a browser, a memory device and a processor, the plurality of servers and the client terminal being connectable with each other via a communications network. The method includes: a) transmitting a first request packet from the browser to one of the plurality of servers for requesting identity of an intended server maintaining a shared data file; b) receiving the first request packet at the one server and transmitting therefrom server specific information to the browser, indicating the identity of the intended server; c) receiving the server specific information at the browser; d) transmitting a second request packet from the processor containing the identity of the intended server to the network for requesting downloading of the shared data file, whereby the second request packet is automatically routed through the network to the intended server; e) receiving the second request packet at the intended server and

15

downloading the requested shared data file from the intended server to the processor, and

storing the downloaded shared data file in the memory device; and f) transmitting from

the intended server to the processor differential data representing a difference between an

updated version of the shared data file currently maintained by the intended server and

the shared data file that was downloaded in step (e) from the intended server to the

processor. The server specific information transmitted to the browser contains the identity

of a second server if the shared data file has been moved from the intended server to the

second server.

In the communications network of the Schroeder reference, a plurality of E-

commerce servers 28, 30, 32 and a UPC (universal product code) image file server 10 are

provided. As shown in Fig. 1, the client browser 22, 24, 26 initially accesses (34) one of the

servers 28, 30, 32 and receives a web page and the identity (36) of the UPC image file

server 10, with which the client browser accesses (38) the server 10. Server 10 forwards an

image file (40) to the client browser, which downloads the image from the server 10. The

downloaded product image is called into the web page at the user terminal.

The cited Bittinger et al. patent relates to CGI (common gateway interface) forms

and allows the server to pass requests from a client browser to an external application.

The web server returns an output from the external application to the web browser.

The Office Action has added DeBettencourt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,279,001) for the

feature directed to server-specific information relating to a second server that contains a

shared file that has been moved. The cited portion of DeBettencourt (i.e., col. 14, lines 34-

52) relates to the situations in which it would not be advisable to allow redirection to a

different Web server. However, as this portion of the reference is understood, it does not relate to the situation in which a shared file has been moved to a different server.

In view of the foregoing, Schroeder, Bittinger and DeBettencourt, even when combined, are not believed by Applicant to teach or suggest the features as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the above, amended claim 1 is believed clearly patentable over the combination of Schroeder, Bittinger and DeBettencourt. Amended claim 7 was rejected on substantially the same ground and is believed patentable for substantially the same reasons.

Independent claims 19 and 23

The position was taken in the Office Action that these independent claims are anticipated by Schroeder. With regard to the feature of these independent claims in which the server-specific information identifies a second intended server if the shared data file has been moved from the first intended server to the second data server, the Office Action has relied upon paragraph [0037] of Schroeder. This portion of Schroeder discusses an e-commerce server that sends an instruction to the browser as to where images can be found. However, as understood, it does not relate to sending an SSI identifying a second intended server to the browser if a shared filed has been moved from a first intended server to the second intended server, as in independent claims 19 and 23. For at least this reason, independent claims 19 and 23 are believed patentable over Schroeder.

17

Independent claims 15-18

Although page 5 of the Office Action is not completely clear in this regard, it appears that these independent claims were rejected as obvious under Section 103 over a combination of Schroeder, Bittinger and DeBettencourt et al. In the Office Action, the position was taken that col. 14, lines 34-52 of DeBettencourt et al. teaches that the server-specific information identifies a second server if the shared data file has been moved from the intended server to a second server. However, as was discussed above with regard to the rejection of claims 1 and 7, this portion of DeBettencourt et al. does not relate to the situation in which a shared file has been moved to a different server. Thus, even when these references are combined, they do not meet all the limitations of independent claims 15-18.

The other claims are dependent on one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 10, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant

19